

## **REMARKS**

### Claim Objections:

The objections to Claims 1-20, 22-28 and 30-34 detailed on page 2 of the Office Action have been remedied it is submitted by the corrections made as specified in the attached amended claims.

### Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112(1):

Page 18, line 10 to page 19, line 1 of the international application, WO 2005/094102, included in the file wrapper of the present application. The recited passage in the amendment above was not electronically transferred to the paragraph numbered version of the specification, also a part of the file wrapper of the present application. It is requested that this recited passage be considered as part of the originally filed US application in prosecution of the present application.

It is submitted that this correction will remedy the objections to Claim 12 on page 3 of the Office Action.

### Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112(2):

It is submitted that the objections to Claims 5, 19, 22-24, 26, 34 have been remedied by the correction of the dependencies as per the amended claims.

### Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

The invention claimed in claim 1 relates to a miniaturised base station devised for indoor use in a WCDMA network designed with a complete base station unit being designed as a separate docking unit locked in a support unit by cooperating snap locking means.

Claim 1 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Costa et al., Pat. No. US 6126128 A, in view of Shapira et al., Pat. No. US 6640110 B1.

Costa discloses a mounting bracket for attaching a cellular phone base station to a fixed object including adjustment devices so that the base station may be accurately directed, or aimed, after installation. The bracket is C-shaped and provides a rigidifying skeletal frame for an electrical box housing the base station. By this arrangement, the box can be constructed relatively smaller and lighter than previously known boxes for such base stations. The bracket also includes structural features which cooperate with the box to enable the box to be installed by a single service technician e.g. snap fit means of the bubbled portion 63 enabling the housing 53 to be temporarily secured to the mounting assembly 1 so that the service technician can release the housing 53.

The invention claimed in pending claim 1 differs from Costa in that it discloses:

- a complete base station unit being designed as a separate docking unit locked in said support unit,

- a power supply unit and
- snap locking means arranged in said support unit and base station unit, allowing an easy installation/removal of said complete base station unit in/from said support unit.

The effect of these differences is that it allows an easy installation/removal of said complete base station unit in/from said support unit as the complete base station unit is designed as a separate docking unit locked in said support unit by cooperating snap locking means. Whereby the objective problem to be solved must be considered as: How to provide for easy installation of a base station?

The OA considers that the third bracket 4 in figure 2 of Costa is equal to the support unit claimed in claim 1. The OA further considers that the base station element 53-54 in Costa is designed as a docking unit to be installed by snap locking to the bracket. We respectfully disagree.

A docking station is per definition a device that provides a simplified way of “plugging-in” an electronic device to common peripherals. One definition of docking unit is: “cradle for a portable device that serves to charge the unit and connect it to other sources or destinations” (see <http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/docking+station>).

Costa discloses a bracket, which is a mounting detail, not a docking station, as it neither discloses a power supply nor a detachable connection or cradle for a docking unit. Furthermore, the base station in Costa is not a portable base station suitable for docking, but an ordinary base station which may be a heavy device, see e.g. column 1 lines 52-57. Hence, Costa does **not** disclose a complete base station unit being designed as a separate docking unit locked in said support unit. One could also question if the mounting bracket is even relevant prior art of the invention claimed in claim 1.

The OA notices that the bracket is silent on further limitation that the support unit includes a power supply unit. However the OA considers that this detail is disclosed by Shapira disclosing a scalable telecommunication device wherein the support unit include the power supply unit. However, when making this statement, the examiner does not consider the circumstance that the bracket is only a mounting detail and not a docking station, for receiving said complete base station unit designed as a separate docking unit.

The Examiner considers that the combined teaching of Costa and Shapira would have rendered obvious the invention of claim 1 to implement scalable base station design for improving the flexibility in implement and upgrading the base station. We disagree with this statement. A skilled person looking for an easy way to install a base station would not combine a document disclosing a mounting bracket with the scalable base station disclosed by Shapira, as Shapira does not disclose a solution to the problem of easy installation of a base station.

Even if a skilled person would combine Costa and Shapira, the combined product is not a docketed base station. There is no teaching in Shapira leading the skilled person to the solution of moving the power supply to the mounting bracket. It can therefore not be obvious.

Finally the mounting bracket disclosed by Costa does not disclose snap locking means arranged in said support unit and base station unit, allowing an easy installation/removal of said

complete base station unit in/from said support unit. Costa teaches snap locking means for temporary holding the housing of the base station. However, it does not disclose means snap locking means suitable for installing the base station in the bracket, but for facilitating the installation process, before it is firmly secured by a screw, see column 6, last paragraph.

It must be clear that neither of the cited documents disclose a complete base station designed as a docking unit, nor snap locking means for installing a base station. For these reasons, the claimed subject matter would not be obvious in view of the proposed reference combination of Costa and Saphira.

The same argumentation applies to the cellular radio network according to claim 27.

For at least the above reasons it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter that is particularly pointed out and distinctly claimed in claim 1 and 27 is not obvious in view of Costa and Saphira; and, accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 and of claims 3-20, 22-26, 28 and 30-34 which depend from claim 1 and 27, should be withdrawn and all of claims 1, 3-20, 22-28 and 30-34 should be in condition for allowance.

In the event there are any questions concerning this Amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

No additional fees are believed to be due at this time however if necessary to effect a timely response the Commissioner is authorised to deduct the necessary fees from Deposit account No. 501249.

Respectfully submitted,

/Timothy Platt/

---

Timothy Platt  
Registration No. 43,003

Box 5581  
SE-114 85 STOCKHOLM, Sweden  
tel +46 (0) 8 5988 7200  
fax +46 (0) 8 5988 7300

Customer No. 26288

Date: 30 December 2010